



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

C/C
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,118	11/13/2003	Toshiyuki Takai	671302-2002	8301
20999	7590	11/02/2005		
			EXAMINER	
			HAMA, JOANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1632	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/712,118	TAKAI ET AL.
	Examiner Joanne Hama, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

This Application, filed November 13, 2003, is a CIP of PCT/JP02/04405, filed May 2, 2002 and claims priority to foreign application, 2001-146338, filed in Japan.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to a non-human animal model of oligodendrocyte developmental disorders, wherein the non-human animal comprises a deficiency in chromosomal DAP12 (DNAX Activation Protein 12) gene function and shows an oligodendrocyte developmental disorder, classified in class 800, subclass 13.
- II. Claims 7-13, drawn to an in vivo method of screening for a developmental promoter or developmental suppressor of oligodendrocytes, wherein a test substance is administered to the non-human animal model of oligodendrocyte developmental disorders, classified in class 800, subclass 3.
- III. Claims 7, 8, 9, 12, drawn to an in vitro method of screening for a developmental promoter or developmental suppressor of oligodendrocytes, wherein a test substance is administered to the cell, tissue or organ of a non-human animal model of oligodendrocyte developmental disorders, classified in class 800, subclass 3.
- IV. Claims 14 and 15, drawn to a developmental promoter or a developmental suppressor of oligodendrocytes, classified in class 536, subclass 24.1.

- V. Claim 16, drawn to a method of screening for a therapeutic composition for neuropsychiatric disorders using a transgenic non-human animal comprising a deficiency in chromosomal DAP12 gene function, classified in class 800, subclass 3.
- VI. Claim 17, drawn to a therapeutic composition for neuropsychiatric disorders obtained by using a transgenic non-human animal comprising a deficiency in chromosomal DAP12 gene function, classified in class 514, subclass 1.
- VII. Claim 18, drawn to a method for diagnosing neuropsychiatric disorders, wherein the symptoms of the non-human animal model comprising a deficiency in chromosomal DAP12 gene function are used to diagnose the neuropsychiatric disorder, classified in class 800, subclass 18.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Claim 6 link(s) inventions II and III. The restriction requirement amongst the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 6. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional

application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Inventions II and III are patentably distinct. While both Inventions are drawn to methods of screening for a developmental promoter or developmental suppressor of oligodendrocytes, Invention II is drawn to an *in vivo* method, while Invention III is drawn to an *in vitro* method. The steps used in the *in vivo* method are different from those used in the *in vitro* method. The search for Inventions II and III is burdensome because the searches are not coextensive.

Inventions V and VI are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, while the therapeutic composition for neuropsychiatric disorders can be obtained by using a transgenic non-human animal comprising a deficiency in chromosomal DAP12 gene function, the therapeutic compositions can also be obtained by using cells and tissues in *in vitro* methods.

Inventions II/III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process

(MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the developmental promoter or developmental suppressor of oligodendrocytes or myelinogenesis can be obtained by two different methods: *in vitro* or *in vivo*.

Inventions I, II/III/IV, V/VI, VII are patentably distinct. Invention I is a non-human animal model of oligodendrocyte developmental disorders, wherein the non-human animal comprises a deficiency in chromosomal DAP12 (DNAX Activation Protein 12) gene function and shows an oligodendrocyte developmental disorder. Inventions II, IV, and VII are to methods of using the transgenic non-human animal of oligodendrocyte developmental disorders. Invention III is to an *in vitro* method. However, the *in vitro* method depends on cells, tissues, or organs obtained from the transgenic non-human animal model. Inventions IV and VI are products identified by the methods of screening using the transgenic non-human animal model. The search for Inventions I, II/III/IV, V/VI, and VII is burdensome because the searches are not coextensive.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, recognized divergent subject matter, and the search for one invention is not required for the search of the other, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

The transgenic non-human animal model and the methods and subsequent products obtained from the methods of Invention I-VII is drawn to a plurality of neuropsychiatric disorders. The neuropsychiatric disorders are:

1. Nasu-Hakola disease,
2. dementia,
3. schizophrenia,
4. schizotypal personality disorders,
5. obsessive-compulsive disorders,
6. Huntington's disease,
7. Tourette's syndrome.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-5 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

Art Unit: 1632

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.** Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is

found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joanne Hama, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-

272-2911. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays from 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file

Art Unit: 1632

folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

JH

DAVE TRONG NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER